

Directors and officers: Frank A. Munsey, President; Ervin Wardman, Vice-President; Wm. T. Dewart, Treasurer; R. H. Tillinghast, Secretary.

MAIL SUBSCRIPTION RATES: By Mail, Postpaid, Year \$12.00, Six Months \$6.00, Three Months \$3.00. Daily only, 10.00; Sunday only, 4.00; Sunday only, Canada 6.00.

FOREIGN RATES: DAILY & SUNDAY, \$20.00; DAILY only, \$10.00; SUNDAY only, \$5.00. All checks, money orders, etc., to be made payable to The Sun-Herald.

Branch Offices for receipt of advertisements and sale of papers: Principal Office—Herald Building, Herald Square, Tel. Etna 9,000. HARLEM OFFICE—205 West 125th St., near Amsterdam Ave., Tel. 794 Morningglades. Open until 10 P. M.

WASHINGTON OFFICE—535 West 26th St., Tel. 908 Wadsworth. Open until 10 P. M. DOWNTOWN OFFICE—200 Broadway. Open 9 A. M. to 10 P. M.; Sundays, 2 P. M. to 10 P. M.

BROOKLYN OFFICE—24 Court St., Tel. Main 5438. EAGLE BUILDING, 303 WASHINGTON ST., Tel. 1100 Main. Open until 10 P. M. BRONX OFFICE—518 Wall St., Tel. 181st St. Tel. 2669 Main. Open until 10 P. M.

Principal American and Foreign Bureaus: WASHINGTON—The Munsey Building. CHICAGO—208 South La Salle St. LONDON—40-43 Fleet St. PARIS—10 Avenue de l'Opera, 88 Rue du Louvre.

THE NEW YORK HERALD was founded by John Gordon in 1855. It remained the sole property of its founder until his death, in 1872, when his son, also John Gordon, succeeded to the ownership of the paper, which continued in his hands until his death, in 1914. The paper then came the property of Frank A. Munsey, its present owner, in 1920.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1920.

# Hoover's Bomb in the Wilson Camp.

Mr. Hoover's condemnation of the business incapacity and government irresponsibility of Mr. Wilson's Administration and Mr. Wilson's party is true enough and strong enough and damaging enough to make two unmitigated Wilson organs, the New York Times and the World, writhe. Both have endorsed Hoover's ability and judgment time and again. To both he has been a shining light for his interest in the miseries of Europe, his labors to assuage them and his adherence to the theory of the League or some sort of international association to join the nations that are weak for the preservation of peace and for the furtherance of the needs and the ideals of all races.

But when Mr. Hoover says Mr. Wilson's Administration and Mr. Wilson's party are not fit to do this work, are not fit to do any great work, are not fit to be the trained and experienced Republican party, the Times challenges the sincerity of the shift of a man who strongly backed Mr. Wilson for so long but now can say and does say: "I believe that since the armistice the present Administration has made a failure by all the tests that we can apply."

The Times deprecates the state of conscience or mind that could lead Hoover two years ago to stand so strongly for "Wilson in war and peace afterward," but three weeks before this election to demand that the Wilson Administration be relieved of all national power, as the penalty for its incapacity to exercise such power wisely and successfully.

But the simple answer to this is that undoubted incompetence and incomparable failure must, as Hoover puts it, pay the penalty in public affairs as in private affairs, in government as in business, of being put off the job it cannot fill.

And the answer to the disturbed and angry World is just as easy. The World questions Hoover's qualifications, under the circumstances of this campaign, to judge of the merits and the capacity of the Republican party to administer better the affairs of this nation to the interests and safety of the American people than Mr. Wilson's Administration and Mr. Wilson's party can. But the World had such faith in Hoover's purpose, judgment and character only a few months ago that it wanted and strove to make him President of the United States. It proposed and boomed the nomination of Hoover, though this should obliterate the Democratic party, which the World hitherto had supported and served through thick and thin.

Either the World knew Hoover then when it championed him for the Presidency on whatever ticket, or it does not know Hoover now. Either the World's opinion of Hoover was worth something then, or its opinion of Hoover is worth nothing now. And if Hoover was the one man to take charge of the Executive government, if he was anything like the man the World thought he was at that time, and assured the country he was at that time, then the followers of the World itself must decide now that Hoover, not the World, is to be believed; that Hoover, not the World, is to be followed in this national crisis where, as Hoover tells us, "the present Administration has made a failure by all the tests that we can apply" and where "the solemn referendum is not on the League; it is on the failure of the Democratic party."

It is because the American people know Hoover's indignation is true that it carries such force. Hoover declares, not as a Republican but as a proficient workman, a careful investigator and an impartial judge, that Mr. Wilson's party is not fit to meet the country's living needs, not fit

to meet its agricultural, distribution and taxation needs; not fit to meet all the national needs that have demanded attention since the armistice and demanded it in vain. This is the bomb which Hoover drops into the Wilson camp to blow it up.

## Are Men More Exact Now Than They Were in Columbus's Time?

Nobody knows when COLUMBUS was born, or where. Nobody knows what he looked like; he may have been the thoughtful, smooth shaven man whose picture is in the Ministry of Marine at Madrid, or he may have been a bearded, piratical looking person. Nobody knows where he was buried. Nobody knows where COLUMBUS landed. Even he never knew, except that it was on an island off what he believed to be Cathay.

"Isn't it strange?" says the school-boy when he discovers how inaccurate history is in regard to the Discoverer. But is it strange? COLUMBUS had no stenographer, no typewriter, no duplicating machine. There was no copyright office, no museum of natural history, where he could file his story. It is fortunate that LAS CASAS saw it and wrote parts of it before it disappeared. There were comparatively few educated men at that time.

More than four centuries after COLUMBUS's time a group of men met in France armed with all the instruments of exactness that Time has piled up. Geographers, cartographers, ethnologists, etymologists, clerks, secretaries, translators and interpreters swarmed about the statesman. The clerk hire was many times the entire cost of the Columbus expedition.

And yet these exact modern men could not do so word Article X of their Covenant that its meaning should be beyond shading. They could not put Article XXI into such English and such French that the translations must agree. They could not frame Article XXIII in words that would not invite controversy.

Looking at Versailles, old CHRISTOPHER seems to have been rather an efficient cuss. He did get somewhere; and even if he wasn't just where he aimed, it was a good place and upward of a hundred million people bless him for the job he did.

## Blakeley Coughlin Murdered.

If the confession made yesterday to the Pennsylvania State police by AUGUST PASQUALE, a prisoner in the Norristown jail, is true, the kidnapping on June 2 of BLAKELEY COUGHLIN, son of Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE H. COUGHLIN of Norristown, and the subsequent conduct of the criminal constitute a series of crimes amazing in cold-bloodedness and sordidness.

PASQUALE now says that he took the infant from the crib where he lay, put him under his coat, and buttoned that garment tight. When the kidnapper unbuttoned his coat BLAKELEY COUGHLIN was dead, smothered by the man who stole him from his home.

Notwithstanding the death of the infant, who was stolen in order that his parents might be forced to pay for his restoration to them, PASQUALE did not drop his scheme of blackmail. Knowing that the son could never be returned to his parents alive, the abductor wrote the letters signed "The Crank" in which demands were made for pay for the return of the baby, and promises of his restoration were held forth, and apparently he obtained the \$12,000 which Mr. COUGHLIN, against the advice of the authorities, put in a designated spot. PASQUALE was ultimately captured by the police and has been in jail for several weeks.

## In This Tragedy There are Two Circumstances Which Must Not Be Overlooked.

One is the extreme unlikelihood that PASQUALE conceived and executed the crime without confederates. The other is the fact that one who in the commission of a crime commits a crime of higher degree may be prosecuted and punished for the more serious offense though he had no intention of committing it.

AUGUST PASQUALE murdered BLAKELEY COUGHLIN when he smothered that infant; AUGUST PASQUALE and his confederates, if he had confederates, should be put on trial for the crime of murder.

## The Holy Sepulchre.

Besides being the scene of the last Supper the room, according to sacred history and tradition, was also the place where CHRIST stowed Himself after His resurrection, where the election of MATTHEAS to the apostolate took place, where PETER came after his liberation from prison and where the first Christians assembled to break bread.

The room, which was on the second floor of the house, has been described as "a hall of goodly proportion." Some of the drawings of the Last Supper in the catacombs at Rome, it has been asserted, picture this room. It has been represented too in early Italian mosaic and marble works. LEONARDO DA VINCI in his famous painting at Milan and VON GERHARDT in a more recent canvas have given to us their conceptions of this, perhaps the last, meeting place of CHRIST with all His Disciples.

While the building survived the ravages of the Romans in the early Christian era, it was partly destroyed by the Saracens in the eleventh century. It was restored by the Crusaders and turned over to the care of the Augustine monks, but later it was again demolished and rebuilt. When it was taken by the Moslems in the sixteenth century it was in the hands of the Franciscans. After having been held by the Turks for almost four centuries it is finally turned over to Italy, a tribute from the Sultan to Italian interest in Turkey's fate. The building will be restored again to its place as a holy shrine and as one of the important Christian memorials in Jerusalem.

Such a suggestion, coming from such a source, is a remarkable incident even in Governor Cox's remarkable campaign.

Governor Cox has made another mistake of a kindred nature. He calls Colonel THOMAS ROOSEVELT, the son of President THEODORE ROOSEVELT, "a misguided youth."

This epithet, if used at all, should be applied to quite a different ROOSEVELT, namely, FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT, the Tammany candidate for Vice-President on the same ticket with Governor Cox. Indeed, the term "misguided youth" is capable of a wider application and includes any young man or woman who is unwise enough to think of supporting the Wilson ticket at the coming election.

## A Federal Official's Deep Thoughts on Raisins.

We find the Prohibition Commissioner, Mr. KRAMER, quoted as follows on the subject of raisins and the like:

"Dry fruits, such as raisins, may not be legally used in the manufacture of non-intoxicating fruit juices exclusively for use in the home."

Supposing that one citizen, or a million citizens, decide that they will pay no attention to Mr. KRAMER's ukazase about raisins, what can he do about it?

Under the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution a man's house is his castle and may not be searched without a warrant.

Under the Volstead act no warrant shall issue for the search of a home "unless it is being used for the unlawful sale of intoxicating liquor." Sale, not use.

Maybe Mr. KRAMER, with his character about raisins, is trying to make the public laugh. That public has stopped laughing over the scandal of the whiskey running.

If KRAMER is joking he ought to talk about forbidding the stewing of prunes. The dried prune is much more comely than the dried grape.

## New York and New Jersey in a Great Joint Enterprise.

Breaking ground to-day, the New York and New Jersey Bridge and Tunnel Commission will begin the actual digging of the tube under the North River which is to provide dependable means of transit for vehicles between the two States regardless of disputes between transportation corporations and their employees and the vagaries of the weather.

Already passengers are provided for by the Hudson and the Pennsylvania tunnels, and the Pennsylvania line has been used in emergencies for railroad borne freight. But the vast quantity of goods moved by truck between New Jersey and New York is now carried on ferriesboats and subject to unavoidable delays.

How great is the motor vehicle traffic entering and leaving Manhattan each day has recently been disclosed by a survey made by the National Automobile Chamber of Commerce. Every day 130,000 motor trucks use the bridges, 14,000 the ferries. The number of passengers carried by each car averaged 2.7 and the weight of the average truck load was 1.14 tons. The traffic which will be immediately affected by the vehicular tunnel now uses the North River ferries. Concerning this the Automobile Chamber of Commerce says:

"A greater proportion of truck travel is to be found on the Jersey ferries than over the bridges mentioned. During a twenty-four hour count on fifteen ferries the passenger cars totalled 7,364 and the motor trucks 7,482. The count was made by the Interstate Bridge and Tunnel Commission, resulting as follows:

Passengers.		Motor Trucks.	
Ferry.	East, West.	Ferry.	East, West.
Downtown group (5).....	1,116 1,140	Downtown group (5).....	1,864 1,864
Midtown group (6).....	730 740	Midtown group (6).....	1,260 1,281
Uptown group (4).....	1,804 1,829	Uptown group (4).....	460 573
Total.....	3,652 3,712	Total.....	3,584 3,718
Total east and west.....	7,364	Total east and west.....	7,482

In addition to this traffic, a great number of horse drawn trucks, vans and delivery wagons use the ferries, many of which will unquestionably utilize the vehicular tunnel when it is opened. The downtown and midtown ferries, now frequently crowded to a degree which entails costly waste of time, will be relieved of a considerable part of their load. The commission has just announced that plans

for satisfactory ventilation of the tunnel have been completed, and this should influence a considerable number of passenger cars to use it. However, its primary purpose is to provide for the quick and uninterrupted flow of goods between the States.

In this enterprise New York and New Jersey are joint partners, as they should be in a good many other enterprises. The improvement and development of the harbor is a matter for cooperation, not for jealous rivalry.

## The Missapplied Epithets of Governor Cox.

Is JAMES M. COX of Ohio really friendly to WOODROW WILSON of New Jersey, whom he hopes to succeed as President of the United States?

If he was, would he speak of the President as "the stricken man in the White House?"

Has "a stricken man" been administering the government of this great country as its Chief Magistrate for more than a year past?

Was it "a stricken man" who turned ROBERT LANSING neck and heels out of the State Department because the Secretary of State tried to prevent the public from thinking that the President might in fact be disabled from discharging the duties of his office?

Is it "a stricken man" who has been sending messages to Congress, making important nominations to office and issuing political statements to the public to induce them to support Governor Cox for President?

Such a suggestion, coming from such a source, is a remarkable incident even in Governor Cox's remarkable campaign.

Governor Cox has made another mistake of a kindred nature. He calls Colonel THOMAS ROOSEVELT, the son of President THEODORE ROOSEVELT, "a misguided youth."

This epithet, if used at all, should be applied to quite a different ROOSEVELT, namely, FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT, the Tammany candidate for Vice-President on the same ticket with Governor Cox. Indeed, the term "misguided youth" is capable of a wider application and includes any young man or woman who is unwise enough to think of supporting the Wilson ticket at the coming election.

## SLAVERY AND THE LEAGUE.

Another Attempt to Get at the Meaning of Article XXIII.

To THE NEW YORK HERALD: May I have a reply to an interesting letter published in The New York Herald under the caption "Another Discrepancy?"

The disparity exists in the two versions of Article XXIII, but it does not lie in the word "traffic." This positively means "traffic, trade, the buying and selling of women and children." "La traite des blancs" is the white slave trade, "la traite des noirs," or, popularly, "la traite des nègres," is "blacktrading." "Treatment" is "traitement," as used in clause B. The regulation of children's working conditions is provided for elsewhere in the treaty—in Part 12 (Labor).

The English reads: "Will entrust the League with the general supervision of the execution of agreements with regard to the traffic in women and children." The Italian words are omitted in the French version—"contrôle général des accords relatifs à la traite des femmes et des enfants" (inspection and verification of agreements relative to the slave trade in women and children).

According to LITTRE: In political and administrative language "contrôle" is the opposite of action. Hence, in the French text, the League seems to supervise such agreements, whereas by the English it supervises their execution. Is not this discrepancy radical and does it not substantiate the statements made by Mrs. Livermore?

The agreements among the more advanced nations contemplate the restriction or regulation of white, brown, yellow and black slavery. But in China, India, Siam, Persia—all League members in good standing—as also in Turkey, Arabia, Morocco and other Moslem countries, including our own Sulu Islands, the sale of women and children, especially in times of famine or dearth, and not necessarily for immoral purposes, is legal and customary, and the League must take cognizance also of the traffic in women and children.

Wherever there is a lover of fine horses who knows that Man of War and Sir Barton are to meet to-day in a match race there is a human being whose interest is centered in the Kentucky race track, where Canadian curfews have arrested the notable contest. In such a meeting the fine sport of racing reaches its most spectacular development and most gripping form.

We did not conspire to prevent war, or to keep this country from entering the war—BIG BILL HAYWOOD of the I. W. W.

A jury, however, thought BIG BILL and jury score of his associates had done enough to make a Federal prison their abiding place.

It is time that myth was exposed. I speak from personal knowledge of Barnum's Museum at Ann Street and Broadway. There must be persons living who remember it.

I went there in 1863, perhaps earlier, and also later and saw everything on exhibition in the place, and going into the theatre, which was opened late in the afternoon, I saw the great George C. Fox, Ann Swan, whose foot was exhibited to the audience, Flora Berna, a man and half woman, a singer with masculine and feminine voices and dressed in one-half the style of each sex; Barney Williams and his wife and others. I saw there the Sam and Foxes, who had called on the Great Father, Lincoln, and shook hands with one of them.

Polks are deluded who call Barnum a humbug. E. R. DODGE, New York, October 11.

## BARNUM NO HUMBUG?

One Who Was at His Museum Strikes at an American Tradition.

To THE NEW YORK HERALD: In discussing Jenny Lind's art you seemingly reflect on the name of the great showman, Phineas Taylor Barnum. I have seen a great many gibes in the press about that great and extraordinary personage, the purport of which is that he was a great humbug.

It is time that myth was exposed. I speak from personal knowledge of Barnum's Museum at Ann Street and Broadway. There must be persons living who remember it.

I went there in 1863, perhaps earlier, and also later and saw everything on exhibition in the place, and going into the theatre, which was opened late in the afternoon, I saw the great George C. Fox, Ann Swan, whose foot was exhibited to the audience, Flora Berna, a man and half woman, a singer with masculine and feminine voices and dressed in one-half the style of each sex; Barney Williams and his wife and others. I saw there the Sam and Foxes, who had called on the Great Father, Lincoln, and shook hands with one of them.

Polks are deluded who call Barnum a humbug. E. R. DODGE, New York, October 11.

## A Misconception.

From the Kansas City Star. "Did you go to your brother-in-law's funeral today, or, as you would say, 'downed'?" inquired an acquaintance from down on Florida Creek.

## SEWARD DEFIED A LEAGUE.

A Civil War Incident That Might Interest Mr. Wilson.

To THE NEW YORK HERALD: Since President Wilson in his endeavor to obtain votes for his League of Nations chooses to refer to himself as one who has spent his life in familiarizing himself with the history, traditions and policies of the nation, it seems fitting to inquire what degree of familiarity he shows in his historical writings with the attitude of the United States toward former leagues of nations.

In the "Life of William H. Seward," by Thornton Kirkland Lathrop, in the "American Statesman Series," the author says at page 249:

"Seward's first serious anxiety as to our foreign relations was caused by learning, through Russia, that the French Emperor had proposed to England that they should act in concert in their course toward the United States, and that England had assented; that Russia had been invited to join this league and had declined; but that it was confidently expected that the smaller European Powers, and those having less interest in the matter, would follow the lead of France and England."

This intelligence showed him that our quarrel was not only mainly our own affair; that we were not to be permitted to settle it in our own way, but were possibly to be threatened with a combined pressure from the European Powers, which would ultimately force us to acquiesce in the breaking up of the Union.

Upon learning this arrangement Seward immediately took steps to counteract it. He notified our Ministers that this Government would not recognize any such understanding between France and England, and would decline to receive any communications as joint proposals from these two or any two or more countries.

He adhered to this resolve when the British and French, which the American press had just offered of mediation. He insisted on receiving them in separate interviews at different times and discussing each proposition as if it were a distinct matter, wholly unconnected with the other.

The reader of Mr. Wilson's "History of the American People" will look in vain in that work for any allusion, however remote, to this most interesting episode, notwithstanding that it is well authenticated.

Frederick D. V. Seward pronounces the scene at the State Department when his father declined to receive together the two Ministers, Lord Lyons and M. Mercier, to have had more influence upon the affairs of the nation than any pitched battle.

"No, no, no; this will never do!" exclaimed the American Secretary of State, "I have not submitted to voluntarily accept and enforce non-intercourse with the culprit. No time now for the delays elsewhere stipulated. The world of the League must find itself united in judging upon conflicting claims of the belligerents—or it must find itself divided into two great hostile camps—and all this immediately."

Third—Article XXV requires the League to invite member States to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of any dispute with a member State or with any other State. If the invitation be refused and the outsider resort to war against a member of the League "the provisions of Article XVII shall be applicable as against the State taking such action."

Again separate determination and action. The League seems simpler than the other—yet the outsider might claim aggression on the part of his adversary, leaving him no time to accept the attentions of the League. Hence again, possibility of difference of opinion and no judge set up in Israel.

So much for new war engagements. There are two cases of abstention from war. First—In case of judgment to arbitration "the members agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award that may be rendered and that they will not resort to war against a member of the League which complies therewith." Article XXIII.

But the submission of disputes to arbitration is not obligatory.

Second—A dispute likely to lead to a rupture, and not submitted to arbitration, must go to the Council of the League. It may be transferred to the Assembly.

In this case the members agree not to resort to war against a disputant who complies with a recommendation of settlement, when such recommendation receives a specified proportion of the votes in Council or Assembly, respectively.

Again, the League seems simpler than whether or not a disputant does or does not "comply with," etc., with an honor bound abstention from war if a member believes compliance demonstrated.

If neither of the disputants accepts the recommendation, if it has not received the stipulated number of votes, then abstention becomes an agreed delay of three months, not submitted to arbitration. This period having passed, the parties may have a legitimate war.

Concerning these matters we should ask ourselves the following questions:

First—Will fifty separate judgments, constrained by ambiguous covenant phrases, produce, when applied to complex situations, more war provoking discrimination between governments than that produced by unconstrained judgments?

Second—Will the ambiguities surrounding each case arising under the covenant produce in our composite population violent feelings that might easily lead to domestic strife?

Third—Can the treaty making power constitutionally subject the war making power to the League? Is it possible to impose by the covenant?

Fourth—Granting the constitutionality of such action, do we want it done?

Fifth—Since a treaty is a law and since the President is the executor of the law, may he not claim the right and duty of interpreting the facts connected with our covenant obligations, and, without consulting Congress, use all means available to him for the fulfillment of our obligations?

Sixth—Or may he refuse to set our forces in motion, Congress having declared war under conditions deemed by the President to be in violation of our League covenants?

Seventh—Granting that such power might, under our system of Government, automatically go to the Executive, if we enter the League, what would be the situation with such possibilities?

Eighth—Knowing that the constitutionality of vital elements in the covenant will almost certainly be challenged, and that at a moment critical in the affairs of some who may be leaned upon by our undertakings, is it prudent for ourselves and fair to others to enter into agreements thus menaced?

A Misconception. From the Kansas City Star. "Did you go to your brother-in-law's funeral today, or, as you would say, 'downed'?" inquired an acquaintance from down on Florida Creek.

replied Capt Johnson of Rumpus Rides, Ark. "I aimed to, all right enough, but my callertations got soter upset. Gabe didn't die."

## A LEAGUE OF MAZES.

Ambiguity Piled on Ambiguity in the Wilson Covenant.

To THE NEW YORK HERALD: President Wilson's interpretations of the League covenant are interesting and helpful, but they are not controlling. What is written, is written. We must try to understand for ourselves just what the great contract means, as it was signed by our negotiators.

First—Each member State binds itself to respect and preserve, as against external aggression, the territorial integrity and existing political independence of every other member.

The obligation thus incurred is not dependent upon any League action whatever. The Council is only "to advise upon the means by which this obligation may be fulfilled."

It may fail to do so. Other members may conclude in a given case that the situation contemplated in Article X. has not arisen. There is plenty of room for difference of opinion. Mr. Wilson, that member whose Government believes that the contemplated situation has arisen is in honor bound to take steps generally of warlike character.

Second—Article XVI provides: "Should any member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Articles XII, XIII or XV, it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a member of the League or not."

This drastic provision is followed by the prescription of an advisory duty laid upon the Council which shall "recommend" what effective military, naval or air force shall be contributed by the respective members. But, as before, the separate determination and execution of their duty remains as an obligation upon the members.

Again we find wide scope for difference of opinion as to the facts of the case and their relevancy to Article XVI. And again if a member believes the contemplated situation to have arisen he is in honor bound to commit the hostile acts as specified in the covenant. They will be directed not only against the supposed covenant breaker but also against any other nation which does not voluntarily accept and enforce non-intercourse with the culprit. No time now for the delays elsewhere stipulated. The world of the League must find itself united in judging upon conflicting claims of the belligerents—or it must find itself divided into two great hostile camps—and all this immediately."

Third—Article XXV requires the League to invite member States to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of any dispute with a member State or with any other State. If the invitation be refused and the outsider resort to war against a member of the League "the provisions of Article XVII shall be applicable as against the State taking such action."

Again separate determination and action. The League seems simpler than the other—yet the outsider might claim aggression on the part of his adversary, leaving him no time to accept the attentions of the League. Hence again, possibility of difference of opinion and no judge set up in Israel.

So much for new war engagements. There are two cases of abstention from war. First—In case of judgment to arbitration "the members agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award that may be rendered and that they will not resort to war against a member of the League which complies therewith." Article XXIII.

But the submission of disputes to arbitration is not obligatory.

Second—A dispute likely to lead to a rupture, and not submitted to arbitration, must go to the Council of the League. It may be transferred to the Assembly.

In this case the members agree not to resort to war against a disputant who complies with a recommendation of settlement, when such recommendation receives a specified proportion of the votes in Council or Assembly, respectively.

Again, the League seems simpler than whether or not a disputant does or does not "comply with," etc., with an honor bound abstention from war if a member believes compliance demonstrated.

If neither of the disputants accepts the recommendation, if it has not received the stipulated number of votes, then abstention becomes an agreed delay of three months, not submitted to arbitration. This period having passed, the parties may have a legitimate war.

Concerning these matters we should ask ourselves the following questions:

First—Will fifty separate judgments, constrained by ambiguous covenant phrases, produce, when applied to complex situations, more war provoking discrimination between governments than that produced by unconstrained judgments?

Second—Will the ambiguities surrounding each case arising under the covenant produce in our composite population violent feelings that might easily lead to domestic strife?

Third—Can the treaty making power constitutionally subject the war making power to the League? Is it possible to impose by the covenant?